For the Northern District of California

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
7	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
8		
9	KATHLEEN ESPINOSA, et al.,	
10	Plaintiffs,	No. C 06-04686 JSW
11	v.	
12	CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, et al.,	ORDER CONTINUING PRETRIAL CONFERENCE AND
13 14	Defendants.	TRIAL DATES

In light of the criminal trials on the Court's docket, which take precedence over civil trials due to the Speedy Trial Act, the trial in this matter will not be able to start on the scheduled day of December 2, 2013. Therefore the Court HEREBY CONTINUES the pretrial conference and trial to February 10, 2014 at 2:00 p.m. and March 10, 2014 at 8:00 a.m., respectively. Jury selection will begin on March 5, 2014 at 8:00 a.m. The continuance of these dates does not create an additional opportunity to file additional documents, such as Plaintiffs' supplemental trial brief, which have not been specifically required by the Court. Pretrial briefs and motions were due two weeks before the initial pretrial conference, on April 2, 2013. To the extent parties seek to file additional pretrial briefs or motions, they shall seek leave of Court upon a showing of good cause.

Under the guise of filing a supplemental trial brief, Plaintiff appears to reargue the Court's rulings on motions in limine. The Court will only consider argument on motions

already decided by this Court that are raised pursuant to a properly filed and supported motion for leave to file a motion for reconsideration.

Plaintiffs also state that they will seek a stipulation to file a supplemental jury instruction based on a California Supreme Court opinion which was issued in mid-August. It is not clear why Plaintiffs waited over two months after California Supreme Court opinion was issued to even suggest that they intend to belatedly request an additional jury instruction. Moreover, despite the fact that the scheduled second pretrial conference is less than one week away, Plaintiffs have not yet filed their proposed additional jury instruction. The Court does not condone Plaintiffs' delay. Plaintiffs shall file their proposed additional jury instruction, either stipulated or disputed, by no later than November 4, 2013. If Defendants dispute the proposed additional jury instruction, Defendants may file a response by no later than November 8, 2013. Again, as noted above, if the parties seek to request any additional changes to the requested jury instructions, they shall seek leave of Court upon a showing of good cause.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: September 30, 2013

JEAFULY . WHITE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE